1:Gallin E-4,5 (1957-1958) 1966
AD5 Taiwan Hokkien AD5
Taiwan AD6
Formosa AD1

the land reform act, and used the money for additional investments.

Many former landlords have done poorly at business, and some have even failed because of their lack of experience and training. Others have maintained their economic investments in the villages. Several formerly large landholders in the two villages adjacent to Hsin Hsing continue their activities in their villages and the surrounding area very much as before. Although their landholdings were cut significantly by the land reform, they nevertheless retain their maximum three *chia* of land. Also, in some instances, a number of landlords prior to the 1953 act managed to retain control of more than the three *chia* limit by legally dividing their family and then transferring portions of their land to the names of other members of their family. By virtue of their positions many landlords, especially those who worked as minor officials or civil servants in the local administration or who were well acquainted with officials, became aware of the ins and outs of the proposed land reform laws and so knew exactly how to manipulate their landholdings legally in order to retain as much land as possible.

Even today landlords may, and do, buy land in excess of three *chia* and then hire laborers to till it for them. As long as they do not rent the land out they seem to be safe from legal action. A few landlords who manage to buy additional land are still doing so in the names of other members of their family and in such cases then actually rent the land out to tenants. But it appears that the fear of another Land Reform Program in the future, as well as the increased movement of the landlords' economic interests outside the rural area, serves to deter many landlords from attempting to reaccumulate landholdings, even by the devious but legal means.

Another frequent activity of landlords who have chosen to maintain their economic interests in the Hsin Hsing area is that of moneylending. The small farmer, having little to offer as security, still continues to resort to the local moneylender for cash or other loans. The local moneylender lends fairly large amounts for longer periods of time than any agency of the government or association but, of course, at extremely high interest rates.

The landlords will continue to engage in moneylending as long as the farmer has credit difficulty. If a good profit can be made from moneylending, it is evident that the wealthy landlords will not willingly transfer their economic interests into more productive economic activities.

Traditionally, the village landlord has played a major role in the leadership of his village and its immediate vicinity. During the Japanese period, such leadership roles were greatly reinforced by the Japanese, who preferred to handle village problems through the wealthy landlord class rather than by dealing directly with the "peas-

1:Gallin E-4,5 (1957-1958) 1966
AD5 Taiwan Hokkien AD5
Taiwan AD6
Formosa AD1

ants." The Hsin Hsing villagers readily recall that the local Japanese police and officials showed respect only for the well-to-do landlords. Consequently, if the villagers were to get along successfully with the Japanese, they had to work through their landlords. They usually elected a landlord to handle local village affairs and to represent village interests in dealing with the Japanese authorities.

The arrangement was also to the landlord's advantage. As the official leader, he wielded greater power by which he could more easily manipulate the villagers, and even the tax collector, to his own advantage. His recognition as a leader by his fellow villagers and by the authorities also increased his prestige.

Not only was such a landlord the elected village political leader but he might often be an informal leader as well, a person who took an active part in most of the social and religious affairs of the village. He usually contributed money and time to help make these affairs a success. The efforts of the landlord helped to build up his reputation as a public-spirited citizen. Frequently, he assumed the role of mediator in discussions of village and intervillage problems and in disputes between his own villagers or even between members of other villages. When the landlord's efforts as a mediator extended beyond his own village, he enhanced his own reputation in the whole area and that of his village as well.

These conditions continued after the restoration into the post-land reform period. Today, the landlord class continues in the rural area and wields power in local grass roots politics as well as in socioeconomic affairs. In most villages the recognized leaders are still those who are rich, maintain big landholdings, and have had a fairly good education. Such people may also have influence—perhaps by virtue of a relative—in some government agency. It is still a great advantage to a village to have a wealthy representative of the landlord class to deal successfully with authorities. Many, if not most of the government officials, are drawn from this class, since they are educated and usually wealthy.

However, this picture is beginning to change. Village affairs are being profoundly affected as many former large landlords and traditional local leaders transfer their economic interests and activities away from the land to new business interests elsewhere. When a landlord gives up his major economic interests in the area, it is usually not long before village social, religious, and political activities become much less important to him. Because the personal advantage is gone, he is no longer concerned with maintaining his status or leadership role. He may even move his residence out of the village in order to be closer to his new economic interests.

Villages suffering such a loss of local leadership have reacted in two